

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application. Claims 1-23 and 25 stand rejected and claims 24, 26, and 27 were objected to by the Office Action. Specifically, claims 1, 4, 8, 13, 15-18 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,553,238 to Ginzel et al. (“the Ginzel patent”). Claims 2, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 14, 19-22 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Ginzel patent. Claims 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Ginzel patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,388,559 to Cohen (“the Cohen patent”). The Office Action objected to claims 24, 26, and 27 but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicants traverse the rejections and objections for the reasons stated below.

The Applicants have amended claim 1 to include all the limitations of claim 24. Thus, it is believed claim 1 is now allowable. Claims 2-7, 19-21, and 25 depend directly or indirectly upon claim 1. Since claim 1 is allowable, it is believed that claims 2-7, 19-21, and 25 are also allowable. Claim 24, which depended directly upon claim 1, has been cancelled.

In addition, the Applicants have amended claim 8 to include all the limitations of claim 26. Thus, it is believed claim 8 is now allowable. Claims 9-15, and 23 depend directly or indirectly upon claim 8. Claim 27 has been amended to be dependent upon claim 8. Since claim 8 is allowable, it is believed that claims 9-15, 23, and 27 are also allowable. Claim 26, which depended directly upon claim 8, has been cancelled.

Also, the Applicants have added the phrase “wherein the network interface receives a status change request from the network and the controller responds to the status change request by moving the barrier” to independent claim 16. This phrase is also recited in claim 24 (now amended claim 1), which was deemed to have allowable subject matter by the Office Action. Thus, it is believed that claim 16 is allowable. Claims 17, 18, and 22 are directly or indirectly dependent upon claim 16. Since claim 16 is allowable, it is believed that claims 17, 18, and 22 are also allowable.

Application No. 10/606,984
Reply to Office Action of May 4, 2005

Attorney Docket No. 74229

The Applicants also note that the Office Action did not include an acknowledgment of a filing of a Supplemental IDS on March 21, 2005. The Applicants include herewith a copy of this Supplemental IDS.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required in the Application to Deposit Account No. 06-1135.

Respectfully submitted,
Fitch, Even, Tabin & Flannery

By Kenneth H. Samples
Kenneth H. Samples
Registration No. 25,747

Dated: August 4, 2005

120 South LaSalle Street, Suite 1600
Chicago, Illinois 60603-3406
Telephone (312) 577-7000
Facsimile (312) 577-7007